



CONCORDIA STUDENT UNION

**SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES
HELD ON THURSDAY MARCH 24, 1994 AT 6:30 P.M.
IN H-771, SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS CAMPUS**

CONCORDIA
UNIVERSITY
STUDENTS'
ASSOCIATION

Documents considered:

- BD-D1: A Commitment to Excellence
BD-D2: Memo to J. Chatelain, CRO
BD-D3: Constitutional Declaration

ASSOCIATION
DES ÉTUDIANTS
ET ÉTUDIANTES
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ

1.0 ROLL CALL

CONCORDIA

CO-PRESIDENTS

Lana Grimes
Philip Dalton (8:00 p.m.)

COMMERCE

Kristina Bolh (7:00 p.m.)
Andrea Fernandez
Emmanuel Kamukama

ENGINEERING

Shadi Khader
Andrew Kennedy
Len Podgurny (8:25 p.m.)

ABSENT

Arts & Science: Nada Al-Yazdi, Pascale Batchoun, Marilyne Boyer (w/r) Helen Ora Cohen (w/r)
Fine Arts: Aimée Darcel

ARTS & SCIENCE

Alan Feldman
Genevieve Grenier (7:40 p.m.)
Wissam Jawad
Shafik Mina
Ken McMurray
Christine Vieira (8:00 p.m.)

FINE ARTS

Jonathan Asencio
Jonathan Carruthers

2.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, G. Dubrow, called this meeting to order at 6:50 p.m.

3.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

Moved by: E. Kamukama

Seconded by: W. Jawad

A. Feldman presented an amendment to the agenda.

MOTION TO MAKE ARTICLE 7 OF THE AGENDA ARTICLE 7.2 AND ADD ARTICLE 7.1 'CONSTITUTIONAL DECLARATION'.

Moved by: A. Feldman

Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION

10/0/1

CARRIED

There were no other amendments.

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

4.0 CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

The Chair briefly mentioned that he felt fortunate to be included in the process that sent the gun control petition to Ottawa today.

5.0 BUSINESS

5.1 Students Associated for Muslim Awareness

MOTION TO UNTABLE THE MOTION TO RECOGNIZE STUDENTS ASSOCIATED FOR MUSLIM AWARENESS

Moved by: E. Kamukama

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

The VP Administration, A. Ghaemi, stated that this group was ratified conditionally at the end of May, 1993. He stated that the group has been active and has membership and they have an office. It is just a formality to get them ratified and put on the books.

Motion 652

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Students Associated for Muslim Awareness (SAMA) be recognized as a CUSA group.

Moved by: L. Grimes

Seconded by: S. Khader

E. Kamukama asked if there is another Muslim students' association.

A. Ghaemi replied that there is, but the two groups are of different sects.

S. Khader asked if it was necessary for the Muslim students to have two associations. He added that perhaps other clubs will start to split up.

A. Ghaemi replied that the two groups do not get along at all. He added that if this group's activity is of value, there really should be two associations.

A. Feldman cited the example of Hillel and SAJE, and stated that if there is going to be a policy to stick similar groups together, it should be consistently applied.

A. Ghaemi stated that he was in support of SAJE being a different group on campus, separate from Hillel, and is not sure why it did not happen. He added that Hillel had a problem with SAJE being on campus, but that these two groups have no objection to the other being on campus, so the situation is a little different.

K. McMurray stated that it was pointed out when the original discussion on this matter took place that the differences between these two groups was not only a matter of sect. He stated that they had different purposes, one for education and awareness and the other for social activities.

J. Carruthers asked where the Students Associated for Muslim Awareness office is located.

A. Ghaemi replied that it is in the Centennial bldg. at Loyola, at the Muslim Students' Association has been on campus for many years. There is no problem as far as office space is concerned. He added that this group was already conditionally recognized in May. He stated that SAMA has never been part of the other Muslim student association.

A. Kennedy asked if A. Ghaemi anticipated any other groups will want to split up because of this situation.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

A. Ghaemi replied that this is a possibility of this, but the person who holds the VP Administration position should be prudent and realize when forming two groups is necessary and when it is not.

E. Kamukama stated he hoped there would be some policy to deal with these types of situations in the future.

A. Ghaemi replied that it is necessary to be flexible in such situations in order to meet the students' needs.

K. Bolh stated that religious groups have special needs because of their vast differences.

L. Grimes stated that this group would like to be able to book events on their own and so forth. If the group is formally recognized some of the bureaucratic burden would be lifted from CSU.

S. Khader stated that he is against this movement, and he does not think groups should be able to split when they want to because any group can have a valid reason for wanting to split. He stated that these two groups do not hate each other that much, and that the ones who hate each other are extremists. He stated that they get along just as Roman Catholics and Protestants get along on a day to day basis. He added that there are elections which they can use to avoid feeling pushed around and that there is also CSU and the Judicial Board to come to. He stated that there should not be a precedent set that allows groups to split up.

A. Ghaemi stated that he would rather these two groups united, but that is not going to happen. He stated that the alternative is that these students will just disappear into the student body.

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Moved by: S. Mina
Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION	9/2/1	CARRIED
VOTE ON MOTION	9/2/1	CARRIED

5.2 MOTION TO ESTABLISH AN ORIENTATION COMMITTEE AND NOMINATIONS

MOTION TO TABLE

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. Bolh

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE	11/0/1	CARRIED
--------------------------------	---------------	----------------

5.3 MOTION ON CONCORDIA GUN CONTROL PETITION AND CAMPAIGN

MOTION TO TABLE

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

6.1 CONCORDIA ATHLETICS COMPLEX AND REFERENDUM REPORT

L. Grimes stated that on April 5, 6, 7 the university will present a referendum to the students asking if they are willing to support the building of an athletics complex. She stated that the cost is \$30 million and that the university would like the students to raise \$15 million, which works out to about \$120 per full-time student per year.

L. Grimes stated that a precedent is being set by the university asking the students if they are willing to support this project. She added that the students' negotiators were mandated to ask for a quorum of 40% of the student body. She stated that at the end of the meeting a 29% quorum was agreed upon.

L. Grimes stated that since that meeting there were three other points that were raised. One point is the establishment of an unconditional refund policy (as opposed to having to demonstrate that you cannot afford to pay). At the moment the criteria is being based upon the work study program. She stated she is not yet sure of the assessment that will be used, but this will be further discussed by the advisory council. She added that will be meeting with financial aid tomorrow to find out exactly how financial need will be assessed. She stated that she will be fighting for a lenient assessment that will be in favour of the students.

L. Grimes stated that there were rumours that the government has donated \$10 million dollars. She added that she does not think the university is being straight about exactly where they are getting all their money. She stated that the university denies the \$10 million but that sources from the Commerce students assure that this figure is true.

L. Grimes stated that she would like the Capital Campaign, of which this complex is a part, be co-chaired and that all books, and all documents and all plans of action to raise money be fully open to the co-chair who would be a student. She stated that she was told that all of this information would be fully open anyway. She stated that the make-up of the advisory council for the project will be 50% students.

L. Grimes stated that the third point is that the future management will be 50% students.

L. Grimes stated that the "up to \$4" and the "up to \$6" will have to be finalized before any money is taken from students. She added that as it stands now the project as far as the referendum goes is on its way, and we will be waiting to see if 7500 students vote. She added that the university has asked that promotional material be delivered

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

to CSU and that CSU disperse it and basically be part of an aggressive YES campaign. She stated that the members are free to do as they will.

J. Carruthers stated that the \$10 million figure is very questionable because the administration claims that it has no money secured from the government. He stated that another problem is that administration has offered a budget that says that the first five years students would be paying up to \$4 a credit and for the second five years up to \$6 a credit, and that the commerce students very easily came up with a budget that was far better for students because the first few years only \$2 a credit would be paid. He stated that this is strange discrepancy. He stated he thinks there is are some shifty aspects to this.

J. Carruthers stated that the capital campaign includes other items, such as a ventilation system for the VA bldg., sprinklers for the Hall bldg., new rooms for the buildings at Loyola, and this sports complex. He stated that there is no list of priorities. What is the guarantee that students will not be asked for more money to contribute to the capital campaign after supporting the sports complex? What guarantees are there that the ventilation system will be put in the VA bldg.? He added that some of his constituents get nosebleeds and pass out because the ventilation system is so bad.

J. Carruthers stated that another problem he has is the bias of the administration in wanting all the members of the advisory board to go on the YES side. There is no attempt to illuminate the other side. He added that he is personally on the NO side. The reason for this is that he went to see Mr. Bigelow who is an administrator in the Fine Arts bldg. who deals with the problems such as ventilation, and he does not know anything about the complex. As well, Mr. Bigelow has made phone calls to the head office of Concordia and nobody there knows what is going on either.

The Chair asked for clarification as to the purpose of this discussion.

L. Grimes stated that this is a general discussion because at this level the Board should be very clear as to what sort of a position it should take on the issue as a Board and individually. On the behalf of CSU, she and P. Dalton signed to the ten points on BD-D1. She added that it does not stipulate members of the Board must campaign for the YES side. She added that students should be clear as to what is going on.

J. Carruthers stated that there seem to be a lot of vague things about this project. He stated that there are two choices: to deal with the details now and have the referendum later, or to deal with the details after the referendum. There are only two weeks to push the referendum through before the summer starts, which is not fair to students who are now studying for exams and probably do not have time to read the reports and think about the details of this.

L. Grimes stated that the student body is safeguarded by the 7500 student quorum. She added that she is very furious with the administration who has put "approximately 7500" students on the ads that are in the newspapers, and that the true colours of the university are already showing through. She added that the CRO is also a student, so she will be on guard and a watchdog of the referendum.

L. Grimes stated that she will be requesting two things be added to the ballot, one that this be a one-time capital campaign contribution and two that this is an optional fee that does not have to be paid if one cannot afford it.

L. Grimes stated that there will be another meeting with the university before the referendum where they will have to come clean on more of their figures, they will have to agree how financial need will be demonstrated and they will have to settle on the final figures. She stated that the balance of power is in the students hands and will remain in the students hands with a quorum of 7500.

K. McMurray requested that the university be made to say where the money is coming from. He stated that his department chair mentioned the department would be cutting back \$10 million over the next six or seven years, and he is suspicious as to what is going on.

J. Carruthers stated that Mr. Boisvert said that none of the money for the sports complex will be coming from cuts in other departments.

S. Mina asked if there is a membership fee for all students or a discount.

L. Grimes replied that there is no fee if you are a student, but if you graduate before the complex is built, your membership fee will be discounted.

A. Feldman stated that on the university's promotional material it states that the amount a student pays to the complex will be fully applicable to the membership fee.

A. Kennedy asked if the rumour of the \$10 million that will come from the government is true, is it possible to approach the government and perhaps split the amount of money.

L. Grimes stated that that point has been argued about, and that they said they would sell the naming of the building. She added that if the budget becomes less than expected, they students share should come down, but that is not the way it is, which is absurd because the students should be the last stop to getting this money. She stated that any money that is raised above and beyond the complex will be added to the capital campaign.

A. Kennedy asked why there are no dates for the construction of the other projects, such as the sprinkler systems and the ventilation, while there is a date for the construction of the athletic complex. He stated that there should also be dates for these projects, whether it is after or before the athletics complex.

J. Carruthers stated that there many details that should be worked out before the referendum takes place, and also that as a representative of students he can say the sports complex is being built as well as these other improvements for the students.

E. Kamukama asked if the date of the referendum is set in stone. L. Grimes replied that the university will probably not change the dates, but that this can be used to advantage because it makes for a deadline for the university to answer questions. She stated that at the meeting, CSU were the only people asking questions. She stated that she

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

asked about the \$10 million, but the Commerce students, who were the source of the information, said nothing. She added that she had hoped to come out of that meeting with more.

L. Grimes stated that the reason why the commerce people were silent was because they didn't want to have signed the agreement and then withdraw. The university has said everyone should work together or not at all, so no one wants to withdraw. She stated that she has no objections, if the Board does not mind having a lot of flack come their way in the coming weeks, to saying that questions must be answered by this deadline, and if they are not, 7500 students will not vote.

E. Kamukama asked why it is so hard to come up with a specific figure that the students will pay per credit.

L. Grimes stated that the original figure was \$5 per credit, but it was thought that no one who was here now and would not enjoy the facility would pay that, so the figures were changed to \$4 and \$6, but that still seemed very high, so the university agreed to "up to \$4" and "up to \$6", and in the meantime the final figures will be negotiated.

A. Feldman asked if there is an official NO committee and if there is a mechanism for one to be set up. He asked if the university is willing to fund a NO committee to the same extent it is willing to fund a YES committee.

L. Grimes stated that she asked Jasmine Chatelaine (the CRO) what the university is spending on the YES slant and if they will put as much to support the NO side. She added that she has also asked what rules the university will be following in this referendum, and that she replied she is being employed to oversee and that she should use the Judicial Standing Orders as a guideline.

A. Feldman stated that it is university funds, money that has come from tuition fees and taxes, that is being used to support only one side of the campaign. He wondered if the university is willing to spend any money, if not the same amount of money, for those that wish to mount a formal NO committee. L. Grimes replied that they have not been asked this question.

A. Feldman stated that he too has a problem with the fact that many students will be paying for the complex and never use it. Why could the university not have given themselves a \$15 million dollar interest free loan to fund the complex, and then pay it back in membership fees to students using it in the next ten or so years. Why is this being prepaid by students who will never use it?

A. Ghaemi stated that the Assistant Vice Rector confirmed that ventilation hours were going to be reduced in the Hall bldg. and other bldgs. on campus. He asked why this issue never came through the Concordia Council on Student Life. L. Grimes replied that this complex has been on the CCSL agenda for a long time, but has been dropped for about eighteen months. She stated that at one point, an option was that on the recommendation of only the CCSL, the matter be brought to the Board of Governors, but that she stated that the CCSL does not have the authority or the power to perform such an action.

K. McMurray stated that Lonergan College has been waiting to get its basement renovated for a very long time, and

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

it seems a little fishy to suddenly be raising money for an athletics complex with all these other projects and cutbacks, even if they are not connected.

J. Carruthers stated that it appears this project is in the hands of certain people.

A. Kennedy stated that it has been established that the university is difficult to trust, and that it should be put to them that they answer some questions and give some guarantees, or the Union will campaign on the NO side.

L. Grimes stated that Mr. Boisvert appeared willing to answer questions.

S. Mina stated that he agreed this situation should be played to the benefit of the students.

L. Grimes stated that between now and voting day each Board member will receive a cc'd letter to the university administration detailing all the points that were raised tonight.

6.2 CHANGING OF GENERAL ELECTIONS SCHEDULE REPORT

L. Grimes stated that concerns were raised by L. Podgurny and A. Kennedy regarding the changing of the dates of the general elections. She stated that the constitutionality of the action can be debated and that she is open to questions. She stated that the reason this was done was mainly because of 13 vacancies for Council of Representative positions.

L. Grimes stated that the only logical response to the situation was to reschedule the dates. She stated that if people are concerned about an election fiasco, that has never been the motivation. She stated that she is optimistic about the change being in the Union's favour, because there will be a larger voter turnout on April 5,6,7, because of the University referendum.

A. Feldman stated that it is not constitutionally necessary for the Board to change the dates since it is not even up to the Board to set the dates, but up to the CRO. He added that regardless of a date change, the elections are bound by the constitution to be held in March. He suggested a temporary amendment to allow the elections take place in April.

L. Grimes stated that the constitution was amended to include March, and she and P. Dalton have further amended it by changing the dates to April.

A. Feldman stated that the Board should proceed in such a way as to not have the elections challenged. He stated that it would be prudent to formally adopt that amendment to the constitution. The amendment will not go to referendum and it will only be in effect until the polls are closed.

L. Grimes asked if the date change is feasible under Article 6.2 of the constitution.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

A. Feldman stated that this is a loophole, but not a very good one as it would be superseded by something that says the adoption of any new By-Law must be approved by two-thirds of sitting directors.

The Chair suggested the Board table the motion until another director arrives, to make for two-thirds of sitting directors. He also suggested unanimity of the Board in voting upon this matter.

MOTION TO TABLE

Moved by: L. Grimes

Seconded by: A. Feldman

VOTE ON MOTION

10/0/2

CARRIED

6.3 MOTION TO RECOGNIZE THE ANIMATION CLUB

Motion 653

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Animation Club be Recognized as a CUSA group.

Moved by: K. McMurray

Seconded by: G. Grenier

A. Ghaemi stated that every week individuals come to the VP Administration office proposing to start a club, but the ones that are obviously not legitimate are not brought before the Board. He stated that he feels this club is very valid and that the interest on the part of the members is really there. Signatures have been gathered on behalf of the club.

W. Jawad asked how many signatures have been collected and how much money the group wants.

The club's representative, Margilene Tremblay, stated that she has many signatures and also knows of individuals who did not sign that are interested. She stated the club would require \$1000 for screenings, the year-end screening and some workshops, etc. She added that students have access to the university equipment.

K. McMurray asked if this is a non-academic association. A. Ghaemi replied that it is.

K. McMurray asked if the club is asking for money this year. M. Tremblay replied that it is not.

J. Carruthers asked if there is normally an animation screening at the end of the year. M. Tremblay replied that there is and it is usually supposed to be put on by the Cinema department, but interest has waned.

J. Carruthers asked why not try and organize through the Cinema Students' Association. M. Tremblay replied that the aim is also to reach students who are not in Cinema.

11

A. Kennedy asked if the focus was on looking at animation or actually making it. M. Tremblay replied that it would be mostly on making films, but that there would be screenings as well.

J. Carruthers asked how many of the signatures were from individuals who are not in Cinema. M. Tremblay replied approximately half of the signatures were from students who are not in the Cinema department.

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

6.4 AMENDMENT TO REFERENDUM QUESTION ON HEALTH PLAN

Motion 654

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the referendum question on the Health Plan be amended to change the cost of the plan from \$60.00 per year to \$63.00 and from \$40.00 for January enrollment to \$41.00, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Council of Representatives be authorized to consent to an annual increase of the premiums not to exceed 8%. Anything higher than this figure must be authorized through referendum.

Moved by: L. Grimes

Seconded by: J. Asencio

L. Grimes stated that the figures approved previously did not include taxes. She stated that the \$60 was composed of \$56.76 for the plan and \$3.24 for administration. Someone would have to be hired to work as the Health Plan Administrator for the year. When the taxes were added on the figures went up to \$65.00 and \$43.00, but rather than put the full burden of the tax on the students, the \$3.24 was lowered to \$1.24 to absorb some of the tax. Students will be asked for \$63.00 or \$41.00.

L. Grimes stated that it was omitted that there is the potential each year of the premiums going up. If everyone makes many claims, it is going to be more expensive for that company to carry the plan and they will increase the premium. Each year there will be an increase that is not very negotiable with the insurance company, and the Council of Representatives should have the authorization to raise it without going to referendum. She stated that the increase is usually 15%, but she suggested 8%, any increase bigger than that would need a referendum.

VOTE ON MOTION

14/0/1

CARRIED

A. Feldman's abstention noted for the record.

L. Grimes asked if she could present a motion. She stated that regarding the Health Plan, there was a suggestion the quorum for the referendum that will establish it or not be higher than 2.5%.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

The Chair stated the agenda could be amended with unanimous consent, however there was an objection.

MOTION TO UNTABLE 6.2

Moved by: G. Grenier
Seconded by: J. Asencio

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

The Chair stated that it is not appropriate to hold general elections in April when the constitution states they should be held in January, February or March. He recommended the Council proceed by unanimous consent.

A. Feldman suggested an amendment to the constitution.

Motion 655

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Article 17.1 of the constitution be amended to add the words "or April" at the end.

Moved by: A. Feldman
Seconded by: P. Dalton

A. Feldman stated that the elections cannot take place in March as it is nearing the end of March, and there are already many posters and so forth that say the election will be held on April 5,6,7. Since the elections cannot be changed, the constitution should be changed.

A. Kennedy stated that he believes the amendment is a good idea so as not to make the elections unconstitutional, but the idea of having elections in the constitution for four months seems strange, why not make it at one fixed time.

A. Feldman stated that this amendment, since it is not being submitted to the students in a referendum is only effective until the next annual general election. This amendment is valid for the election that will take place in two weeks, but once those elections have happened this amendment disappears and the constitution still reads March. It is a short term amendment that is in effect for this circumstance only.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT

UNANIMOUS

MOTION TO AFFIRM CO-PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL UNDER ARTICLE 6.1.2 REGARDING ELECTION DATES

Moved by: A. Feldman
Seconded by: K. McMurray

K. McMurray stated that this situation is regrettable that the elections had to be bumped up because of a lack of

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

13

nominations, but it does have benefit as has been mentioned. He stated that had this happened earlier he would be very much against the motion, but as time is short, if this motion is not adopted candidates would only have two school days of campaigning. It is a catch-22 situation.

A. Kennedy stated that he must also vote in favour as it will not serve anybody's interest to vote against it. He stated that the Co-Presidents have the power between meetings to exercise the power of the Board, limited only by policy, regulation or resolution passed by the Board of Directors. Andrew asked if this implies that the Board must resolve the change of dates. He stated that the Board set the dates and it doesn't necessarily mean they can be changed because the Co-Presidents can exercise the power of the Board between meetings.

A. Kennedy stated that a higher turnout does not mean a high number of informed voters. He stated that students who are at the ballot box to vote for the Athletic Complex do not necessarily know about the CSU issues.

C. Vieira stated that L. Podgurny clearly has a problem with this motion, so he should definitely have an opportunity to speak to it.

MOTION TO TABLE

Moved by: L. Grimes

Seconded by: G. Grenier

VOTE ON MOTION

11/2/2

CARRIED

7.1 MOTIONS ARISING FROM CONSTITUTIONAL DECLARATION

A. Feldman stated that according to the constitution, amendments only come into force when they are adopted by the Board. Students in a referendum do not have any power to amend the constitution. The only thing that the student vote does is confirm what the Board does or will do, and that makes it permanent.

A. Feldman stated that the amendments the students voted for are not in effect. None of the changes voted upon have been made legal. He stated that he would hate to see the elections challenged because according to the constitution Co-Presidents were supposed to have been elected.

A. Feldman stated that the name change, the composition of the Board, the term of office and the Presidential system especially needed to be passed. The election is being held under the auspices of the Concordia Student Union which does not legally exist. He added that since the Board rescinded everything from the original package and passed a package that replaced and did not simplify the original one, the reforms needed to be passed by the Board.

P. Dalton stated he agrees with doing this, but it only need happen before the newly elected representatives take their seats.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

14

A. Feldman reviewed the five amendments that deal with the change of the name of the association, the change of the name of the Board of directors, the change of the term of office, the presidential system and the status of independent students.

Motion 656

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the constitution be amended to include the change of association name, change of Board of Directors name, change of term of office, change of presidential system and change of independent student status, the wording of which was already passed by the Board.

Moved by: A. Feldman

Seconded by: L. Grimes

VOTE ON MOTION

15/0/1

CARRIED

A. Feldman asked if the wording of the motion could be amended to say "as passed by the Board February 18, 1994." in order to clarify where the original wording came from.

There was unanimous consent to this suggestion.

MOTION TO UNTABLE ITEM 6.2

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors affirm the Co-Presidents decision to act on behalf of the Board under article 6.1.2 regarding election dates.

Moved by: K. McMurray

Seconded by: A. Kennedy

L. Podgurny stated that the way the wording is read, he is in favour of the motion, because it is too late to do anything else. He stated that he would like to address the concerns that were put into all the members boxes. He added that he has requested responses in writing.

L. Grimes stated that the questions will be answered in writing. She stated that the dates were not changed to create an election fiasco, only to respond to the fact that there were thirteen vacancies. She stated that the vacancies will be filled because the dates have been changed. She added that by coinciding the election with the university's, it will give whoever comes into office a stronger mandate.

L. Grimes stated that in response to A. Kennedy's concern that more voters are not necessarily informed voters, the changing of the dates gives the candidates more time to inform voters.

P. Dalton stated that the decision was constitutionally viable and that the only reason for the change of dates is a 43% vacancy rate. It is a catastrophe to have no Commerce representation and no uncontested seats.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

L. Podgurny stated that he was dismayed because he does not want the new people who are coming in to not take their positions seriously because they weren't as willing to get involved in the first place. He stated that he hoped the new representatives will be as willing as this Board is.

L. Podgurny asked why Presidential candidate positions have not also been opened and was consideration ever given to holding the Presidential election as planned and holding the Council of Representative election in conjunction with the sports complex referendum.

L. Grimes stated that the presidential seats were well contested, while there were no nominations for Commerce or Independent student seats. The constitution says there must be two representatives per faculty, and this would not have happened.

P. Dalton stated that students were asking for information even today about student positions.

L. Grimes stated that having elections at two different times was considered but rejected in favour of having all positions elected at the same time and making it a one shot deal. As well, if they had been held at separate times, the Council of Representatives in conjunction with the sports complex, the President could be elected with only five hundred votes, for example, while the Council of Representatives could be elected with thousands and thousands.

L. Podgurny stated that a distinction should be made between two sitting directors per faculty and two positions available per faculty.

A. Kennedy stated that he is still not convinced that having the election during the sports complex referendum is going to inform more people. It only guarantees there will be more people handed a CUSA ballot.

L. Grimes replied that the candidates will have more time to inform voters.

C. Vieira asked if anyone has considered the fact that the people who submitted their nomination forms last week for the Council of Representatives and the CUSAcop Board of Directors have been given two weeks to campaign, and the people who submit their forms as of noon tomorrow are only given one week. She also asked how the election was being paid for, as it was her understanding that the sports complex referendum bill is being footed by the university. She also asked about candidates who have published information that specified the old dates.

J. Chatelain, the CRO, replied that campaign period started Friday at midnight and the dates were changed on Monday, so there is only a two and a half day difference in campaigning time between the candidates who handed in their forms for the first dates and those who will hand in their forms for the new dates. She added that no one can campaign without bringing the material to her first, and as of yet, no one has started campaigning. All of the candidates were informed of the date change.

J. Chatelain stated that as far as the cost, the only extra cost is that two ads had to be placed in the Link and the Concordian saying that the nomination period had been extended. This was an unforeseen cost. She stated that

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

CUSA election ballot boxes will be at the same five polling stations that they were originally going to be at. The athletics referendum has ten polling stations. The CUSA ballot boxes are separate from the athletics complex ballot boxes. The things that have been amalgamated are the polling clerks, the dates and the ballot counting.

J. Chatelain stated that the only change is that in the Judicial Standing Orders ballot counting for CUSA has to be done the night the polls close, but because of thousands of ballots to count, it was recommended by Dean Counihan that the ballot counting begin in the morning of Friday, April 8. She stated that she has met with the Judicial Board and has asked them to temporarily change the Standing Orders in order to be realistic about the stamina of the ballot counters.

C. Vieira asked if the ballot counters' salaries will be paid by CUSA or by Dean of Students or both. J. Chatelain replied that all the poll clerks and ballot counters will be paid by the Dean of Students. She added that anyone who put money into posters that were wrong will get a total refund.

G. Grenier stated that in response to L. Podgurny's earlier comment, she feels people will take their positions seriously, and that was not a fair comment. People were simply not given enough time to figure out what was going on.

J. Carruthers asked what sort of security and scrutiny the ballot boxes will be under, considering there is a lot of interest in the consequences. J. Chatelain replied that there will be four DRO's acting for the referendum and the CUSA election, this was so that there would be no problems of jurisdiction such as one may get if there are two sets of DRO's. On the night of April 4, all the ballot boxes are brought to the Security offices at Sir George and Loyola by the CRO and DRO's. The ballot boxes are locked in front of the security guard and the keys are put into an envelope which is signed by the CRO, the CRO's and the security guard and is kept in the security offices. A security guard has been assigned for each building and every morning a DRO and a security guard walks the box from the security office to the building, then reverses the procedure in the evening. The security van will be used to bring the boxes from Loyola to Sir George on April 7. On April 8, the security guard will bring the boxes to the ballot counting room and open them with the keys from the sealed envelope.

P. Dalton stated that the Board should return to the original motion.

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

MOTION TO UNTABLE ITEM 5.2

Moved by: L. Podgurny

Seconded by: J. Carruthers

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

MOTION TO ESTABLISH AN ORIENTATION COMMITTEE AND NOMINATIONS

Motion 657

WHEREAS last years' Orientation was hastily put together, and;

WHEREAS many more volunteers were be needed to advertise and encourage Orientation activities, and ;

WHEREAS volunteers are required before the end of the semester;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CUSA form an Orientation Standing Committee whose job it is to promote, plan, approve and fully execute the CUSA Orientation.

Moved by: L. Podgurny

Seconded by: A. Fernandez

L. Podgurny stated that last years' orientation was put together by four main people, with contributions from various members of the Board. During some of last year's Orientation meetings it was discussed that it would be beneficial to start early. A network should start now. A lot of work needs to be done by the end of May. He stated that he hopes members of the Board will volunteer for this, people who are serious about doing work when exams are over, and who also will get volunteers ready for the Orientation.

M. Soso stated that she has been to the university Orientation meetings and they were also discussing getting the ball rolling right away. She stated that she would not mind putting time and effort into helping plan the Orientation.

L. Grimes stated that the budget that was set by the Board of Directors didn't have a line item for 1994/95 Orientation Committee, so there is no money. Also, care must be taken with contracted work as it will fall in the laps of the next administration who may change it all. She suggests making a plan of action and a list of contacts, a schedule and so forth, which could be handed to the next group.

L. Podgurny stated that he will amend the motion so that there will be five members.

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

NOMINATIONS

MOTION TO NOMINATE J. CARRUTHERS

Moved by: L. Podgurny

Seconded by: E. Kamukama

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

MOTION TO NOMINATE A. KENNEDY

Moved by: S. Mina
Seconded by: L. Podgurny

MOTION TO NOMINATE G. GRENIER

Moved by: J. Carruthers
Seconded by: E. Kamukama

MOTION TO NOMINATE J. ASECIO

Moved by: J. Carruthers
Seconded by: E. Kamukama

MOTION TO NOMINATE W. JAWAD

Moved by: A. Kennedy
Seconded by: L. Podgurny

VOTE ON NOMINATIONS

13/0/1

CARRIED

L. Podgurny volunteered to chair these meetings.

MOTION TO UNTABLE ITEM 5.3

Moved by: J. Carruthers
Seconded by: S. Mina

VOTE ON MOTION

UNANIMOUS

WHEREAS gun control has been an issue at Concordia for some time;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CUSA fully support the Coalition for Gun Control.

Moved by: L. Podgurny
Seconded by: S. Mina

L. Podgurny stated that he would like to amend the wording of the motion to coincide with the Joint Senate and Board of Governors meeting of October 21, 1992.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

14

WHEREAS fourteen people were shot to death at Ecole Polytechnique on 6 December 1989, and the Coalition for Gun Control was initiated in response to that event;

WHEREAS on 16 October 1991, the Board of Governors unanimously adopted a resolution of support for the Coalition for Gun Control's efforts to secure more stringent gun control legislation;

WHEREAS five people were shot at Concordia University on 24 August 1992, of whom four have died, by an individual carrying legally acquired handguns; and

WHEREAS founded on the principles that gun ownership is a privilege and that the risks to society associated with possession of handguns far outweigh any potential benefits derived from their possession, the University has initiated a petition campaign to call for federal legislation prohibiting the possession of handguns, except as strictly required by law-enforcement professionals for the purpose of their duties;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CSU Council of Representatives declare their support for this initiative and call upon Parliament to act swiftly and decisively to introduce legislation prohibiting anyone in Canadian territory from possessing any handgun, except members of the Canadian Armed Forces and Law-Enforcement Officers.

M. Soso stated that there were no students on the panel that brought the petition to Ottawa. She stated that at the press conference, much reference was made to the Concordia Student Body, and yet not one student was represented.

L. Podgurny stated that he is sure students of Engineering and Computer Science have been approached, and are involved with the petition. He stated that he is fairly sure they declined the offer to be on the panel because they felt they were doing enough and were worried about time constraints.

L. Grimes stated she supports the banning of all arms, but she is not excited about supporting the Rector place a feather in his hat. She stated that the massacre at the Ecole Polytechnique was carried out with a rifle not a handgun. She feels this is a stroking of the issue.

A. Feldman stated he has concerns about the part that specifies law-enforcement officers, given the tradition of law-enforcement officers in this city, why should they be allowed to bear arms.

E. Kamukama stated that he doesn't agree with blanket motions. This will not stop people from procuring guns if they wish, they can get them on the black market.

M. Giles stated that if the number of shootings in Canada is compared with the States there is no question that the legal right to bear arms has an effect. She stated that people insist on the right to have guns there will be shootings. The reality is that people get shot accidentally and on purpose, why give us a weapon to kill ourselves.

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

S. Mina stated that he would like to propose a friendly amendment in the spirit of L. Grimes comment. Where it says handguns, it should say "firearm".

L. Podgurny stated that this is not a friendly amendment as it changes the spirit of the petition.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CSU Council of Representatives declare their support for this initiative and call upon Parliament to act swiftly and decisively to introduce legislation prohibiting anyone in Canadian territory from possessing any firearm, except members of the Canadian Armed Forces and Law-Enforcement Officers.

Moved by: S. Mina
Seconded by: E. Kamukama

S. Mina stated that this will not conflict with the original motion, it shows the good initiative has been taken a step farther by including all firearms.

L. Grimes asked where this motion is going. She asked if it will be sent to the Rector's office or to Ottawa?

L. Podgurny stated that in consultation with the Rector's office, they said to go approve with it even is after the original presentation. They did not mention where it would go.

L. Grimes asked if the university will receive this amendment as friendly. L. Podgurny replied that he does not know.

A. Kennedy stated that Fabrikant and Lepin both got their weapons legally, and if this can be stopped lives will be saved. He stated that it is better late than never to support the petition.

M. Giles stated that sport hunting exists, and this should be taken into consideration. She asked if we want to support the initiative of the university, or if we want to act on our own, and what will then be done with the motion. She stated the Board should consider the power of the amended motion. There are concerns about endorsing a project that is a publicity stunt.

P. Dalton suggested a further amendment.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CSU Council of Representatives declare their support for this initiative and call upon Parliament to act swiftly and decisively to introduce legislation prohibiting anyone in Canadian territory from possessing any handgun, except members of the Canadian Armed Forces and Law-Enforcement Officers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT CSU Council of Representatives declare their support for this initiative and call upon Parliament to act swiftly and decisively to introduce

legislation prohibiting anyone in Canadian territory from possessing any firearm, except members of the Canadian Armed Forces and Law-Enforcement Officers.

J. Carruthers stated that he is against this motion because the types of guns that should be banned should be taken into consideration.

M. Soso stated that Fabrikant stole handguns from his wife. She stated that if all firearms are banned, the demand from the underground is going to increase and they will become more accessible.

S. Mina stated that although this resolution will not change the world, it is still a step in the right direction.

A. Kennedy stated that in a country where guns are available, the United States, fifty-six corner store owners have been murdered in New York in the last year. If it was harder to get guns, maybe some of them would still be alive.

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Moved by: A. Feldman

Seconded by: K. Bolh

VOTE ON MOTION

8/5/0

FAILED

MOTION TO CLOSE THE SPEAKERS LIST

Moved by: L. Podgurny

Seconded by: A. Feldman

VOTE ON MOTION

11/2/0

CARRIED

J. Carruthers stated that on a personal note, he lived with Native Canadians for six months and when rifles are banned, parts of their culture are taken away. This issue must be looked at in a refined way, including which types of guns should be banned. He stated that this issue requires more thought, and would like to divide the motion.

MOTION TO DIVIDE THE MOTION

Moved by: J. Carruthers

Seconded by: K. Bolh

VOTE ON MOTION

10/2/1

CARRIED

The chair clarified that the original motion to ban handguns will be discussed, then the motion to ban firearms.

J. Asencio stated that this is a complicated issue, and more debate is definitely needed. He stated that research and

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm

facts are needed, perhaps that should happen before the discussion is continued.

P. Kamukama stated that there are all sorts of social situations that go along with crime and murder, it is not necessarily only a question of guns. He stated he does not understand why the question is being split, when most are concerned about semi-automatic weapons.

P. Dalton stated that Canada has a standing army, and there are not many people to fight, so it should be considered why there is a standing army, power of the state. He wondered where civilian resistance fighters throughout history have gotten their guns. He stated these two points should be considered when voting on this motion.

The chair re-read the motion.

Motion 658

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CSU Council of Representatives declare their support for this initiative and call upon Parliament to act swiftly and decisively to introduce legislation prohibiting anyone in Canadian territory from possessing any handgun, except members of the Canadian Armed Forces and Law-Enforcement Officers.

VOTE ON MOTION

8/4/3

CARRIED

MOTION TO EXTEND HALF AN HOUR

Moved by: L. Podgurny

Seconded by: N. Al-Yazdi

VOTE ON MOTION

10/3/0

CARRIED

The chair clarified that the second part of the motion is now under discussion, and read the appropriate section.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT CSU Council of Representatives declare their support for this initiative and call upon Parliament to act swiftly and decisively to introduce legislation prohibiting anyone in Canadian territory from possessing any firearm, except members of the Canadian Armed Forces and Law-Enforcement Officers.

S. Mina stated he would like to see this passed because otherwise, all that is being done is adding legitimacy to an initiative taken by the university.

M. Giles stated that people will kill other people, and inanimate objects cannot be blamed. She stated there are deeper issues involved, and we should be careful with what we do and say.

L. Podgurny stated in response to S. Mina, this issue was brought up at one of last year's CUSA Board of Directors meeting, and that a letter of July 7, 1993 was addressed to L. Grimes and P. Dalton regarding this issue, but it was

not brought up at the Board. He stated that he agrees with M. Giles that it is not a question of inanimate objects killing people, and that this petition will not be an end-all and be-all solution, but it will help.

M. Soso stated that Professor Buckner at Concordia has been writing reports to the Rector that many things that have been said are statistically wrong, but he has not been acknowledged. He is willing to come and speak to this Board at the Board's convenience.

M. Giles stated that there is a difference between a rifle and a handgun. If Fabrikant had walked past the security desk with a rifle things may have turned out quite differently. Handguns are much easier to conceal.

J. Carruthers stated that he feels what S. Mina is saying is important and he is in no way against the spirit of this motion. He stated that the Board should take M. Soso's advice and get more information and knowledge, and perhaps have Prof. Buckner come and talk. He stated that he thinks the Board should continue with this motion on solid footing.

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION

Moved by: L. Podgurny

Seconded by: N. Al-Yazdi

VOTE ON MOTION

12/3/0

CARRIED

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION

P. Dalton, L. Grimes, A. Kennedy, A. Fernandez, E. Kamukama, J. Carruthers and J. Asencio voted against the motion.

N. Al-Yazdi and S. Mina voted in favour of the motion.

A. Feldman, S. Khader, G. Grenier, W. Jawad, K. Bolh and L. Podgurny abstained from the motion.

VOTE ON MOTION

2/7/6

FAILED

7.1 CONSTITUTIONAL DECLARATION

A. Feldman stated that "if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch". He stated that in order to write a constitution that will work, it is necessary to follow the masters. He proposed a completely new constitution remodeled after an existing constitution mutatis mutandis. He circulated a sample and read it (BD-D3).

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Moved by: P. Dalton

Seconded by: L. Grimes

VOTE ON MOTION**UNANIMOUS**

This meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 pm

G. Dubrow, Chair

G. Grenier/S. Segal
Secretary

March 24, 1994 at 6:30 pm